



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,746	03/07/2002	Robert D. Feldman	FELDMAN 11-1-1-2-8	2870
46363	7590	04/30/2007	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			WANG, QUAN ZHEN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2613		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		04/30/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,746	FELDMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Quan-Zhen Wang	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-14,16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-14,16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In view of Applicant's response filed on March 26, 2007, the final Office Action mailed on January 26, 2007 has been withdrawn. A new Office Action is as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-14, 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks et al. (U.S. Patent US 6,483,616 B1) in view of Rowley et al. (U.S. Patent US 4,833,668).

4. Regarding claims 1 and 10, Maddocks teaches a method, comprising: reducing the power level of an optical data signal (the drawing, signal from amplifier 8) propagating in the optical fiber path (column 3, lines 44-49). When only one fiber is used for the system, the counter-propagating supervisory channel is propagating in "the optical fiber path".) in response to a loss of a counter-propagating supervisory signal (the drawing, supervisory signal generated from supervisory insert 16) in another optical fiber path (the drawing, fiber 6); reducing counter-propagating optical power (the drawing, data signal from amplifier 15) in response to a loss of the optical data signal

(the drawing, the loss of data signal from amplifier 8; column 2, lines 63-67 and column 3, lines 1-15). Maddocks differs from the claimed invention in that Maddocks does not specifically disclose responsive to the loss of the optical data signal, reducing counter-propagating optical signal power output from at least one additional network element. However, reducing counter-propagating optical signal power output from at least one additional network element (the drawing, amplifier 18) in response to the loss of the optical data signal is simply repeating the process of for reducing the optical power from amplifiers 11 and 15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reduce the counter-propagating optical signal power output from at least one additional network element (the drawing, amplifier 18) in response to the loss of the optical data signal, as it is done for amplifiers 11 and 15, in order to permit personnel to effect repairs safely.

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Maddocks further teaches that the step of reducing the power level of the optical data signal and the step of reducing counter-propagating optical power are performed substantially at the same time (column 2, lines 63-67 and column 3, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 4, the method of Maddocks inherently comprises reducing pump power supplied by at least one pump source (the light signal generated by amplifier 8) coupled to the optical transmission line (the drawing, optical fiber 7).

Regarding claims 5 and 13-14, the method of Maddocks inherently comprises reducing counter-propagating pump power supplied by at least one pump source coupled to the optical transmission line (column 2, line 67 and column 3, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 6-7, Maddocks further teaches that the power level of the optical data signal is reduced by a predetermined amount such that harm from an optical signal emanating from a fault in the optical transmission line is substantially reduced (column 3, lines 13-17).

Regarding claims 8-9, Maddocks further teaches that the method further comprising the step of restoring the power level of the optical data signal in response to the presence or a notification of the presence of the counter-propagating supervisory signal (column 3, lines 49-58).

Regarding claims 16 and 20, Maddocks teaches a network element adapted for use in an optical transmission system, comprising: a first gain element (fig. 1, amplifier 8), for providing an upstream optical signal to an optical transmission line (fig. 1, optical fiber 5); and a controller (fig. 1, laser control 21), for reducing the power level of the upstream optical signal generated by the first gain element in response to the absence of a counter-propagating supervisory signal (fig. 1, supervisory signal in fiber 6); a second gain element (fig. 1, amplifier 18), for providing a counter-propagating downstream optical signal (fig. 1, signal in fiber 6) to an downstream optical fiber path; the controller, for reducing the power level of the counter-propagating downstream optical signal generated by the second gain element to the downstream optical fiber path in response to the loss of an optical signal propagating in the downstream optical fiber path (column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 42; The description is applicable to the laser control 21 when a fiber cut occurs in fiber 6); the controller, in response to the absence of the counter-propagating supervisory signal, provides an indication to a

downstream network element (fig. 1, laser controller 21; column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 42) that the supervisory signal is absent. Maddocks differs from the claimed invention in that Maddocks does not specifically teach that the supervisory signal is counter-propagating in the upstream optical fiber path. However, it is well known in the art to counter-propagating a supervisory signal in the same fiber path for the signal. For example, Rowley discloses counter-propagating a supervisory signal in the same fiber path (fig. 2, supervisory from second station to first station and detected at first station by supervisory and error detector circuit 16) and carrying out normal fault checks (column 5, lines 27-36) using the supervisory signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to configure the system of Maddocks to counter-propagate a supervisory signal in the upstream optical fiber, as it is taught by Rowley, in order to quickly detect the fault if there is a fiber break.

Regarding claim 18, Maddocks further teaches that the network element comprises a repeater (column 2, lines 14-33).

Regarding claim 19, the gain element (fig. 1, amplifier 8 or 18) inherently comprises at least one of an optical amplifier and a pump source.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments on claims 16 and 18-20 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Art Unit: 2613

6. Applicant's arguments on claims 1, 3-10, and 12-14 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Applicant argues, "Maddoeks teaches, in column 3, lines 43-48, that in a bi-directional single fiber system, due to reflection of a transmitted signal back into a receiver unit, the receive circuit would continue to receive a signal even ha the event of a fiber break. In order to discern the fiber break condition, Maddoeks' system would require a modification. Thus, Maddoeks teaches, ha col. 3, lines 49-57, that art identifier signal, which uniquely identifies a particular transmitter, needs to be transmitted over the supervisory channel. In the event of a fiber break, 'receipt of an identifier signal which differs from that expected under normal operation will cause the laser amplifiers to be shut down' (see col. 3, Lines 52-54, emphasis added)". However, Maddocks' system still discloses "reducing the power level of an optical data signal in response to a loss of a counter-propagating supervisory signal", which read the claimed invention. The modification of Maddocks' system is simply to ensure that the detection of the "loss of a counter-propagating supervisory signal" because Maddocks realizes that without an identifier signal, even when the counter-propagating supervisory signal is actually lost, the detector might not detect the loss of the counter-propagating supervisory due to the reflection of the fiber cut. The additional feature of Maddocks ensures that the detector detects the loss of a counter-propagating supervisory signal and makes the system more reliable. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1 and 10 still stand. For the same reasons, the rejections of claims 3-9, and 12-14 still stand.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yoneyama (U.S. Patent US 5,535,037) discloses an optical repeater which transmits a response signal counter-propagating in the fiber path.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quan-Zhen Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3114. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

qzw
4/25/2007


JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600